

Attorney Docket No.: 8920-000005

claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.").

In the present Office Action, the P.T.O. cites Sengupta *et al.* (1990) taken with Kubicek *et al.* to support the rejection. The P.T.O.'s rejection is based on the statement on page 2 that "Kubicek *et al.* disclose the production of cellobiase in the presence of the glycosylation inhibitors tunicamycin or 2-deoxy-D-glucose in a concentration of about 50 µg/ml in similar process of producing cellobiase using the fungus *Trichoderma reesei*." However, claim 3 (and claims 6-12 by dependence) recites "an enzyme preparation containing high cellobiase activity." Kubicek is inapposite as a reference, because it does not disclose the production of cellobiase in the presence of a glycosylation inhibitor. Instead, Kubicek discloses inhibition of glycosylation, biosynthesis, secretion and/or enzyme activity of endoglucanases I and II by tunicamycin or 2-deoxy-D-glucose, as well as inhibition of total cellular, extracellular, and/or intracellular protein biosynthesis by tunicamycin or 2-deoxy-D-glucose. Kubicek does not address the effects of these or other glycosylation inhibitors on cellobiase activity. Furthermore, Kubicek teaches in the first paragraph that cellobiase (EC 3.2.1.21) is a enzyme distinct from endoglucanase (EC 3.2.1.4). Because Kubicek does not disclose the production of cellobiase in the presence of a glycosylation inhibitor, Kubicek cannot be combined with Sengupta to teach or suggest all claim limitations, as required to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Applicants, therefore, submit that Kubicek is inapplicable as a reference in regard to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and respectfully request that the rejection of claims 3 and 6-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) under a combination of Sengupta and Kubicek be withdrawn.

As requested by the Examiner during the telephonic interview on April 29, a copy of Kubicek is provided herein to replace the copy that was unavailable to the Examiner during the interview.

It is believed that the claims are in a condition for allowance and such favorable action is respectfully requested. If, however, any of the claims are deemed by the P.T.O. not to be in a condition for allowance, Applicants request an interview with the P.T.O. so that any remaining issues can be resolved.

Attorney Docket No.: 8920-000005

Should any questions arise, the P.T.O. is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Saul L. Jackson
Reg. No. 52,391
Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.C.
7700 Bonhomme, Suite 400
St. Louis, Missouri 63105
(314) 726-7500